DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 733 EA 028 298

AUTHOR	Petersen, Wesley O.
TITLE	Principals' Values: Coming to Shared Purposes through a Values-Laden Sense of Identity?
PUB DATE	Feb 97
NOTE	21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Hilton Head, SC, February 1997).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Organizational Communication; Organizational Effectiveness; Organizational Objectives; *Principals; *School Culture; *School Effectiveness; Teacher Attitudes; *Values

ABSTRACT

An organization originates in order to serve consciously developed purposes. In addition, school leaders perform in contexts in which core purposes are rarely certain. This paper presents findings of a study that examined the relationship between principals' and teachers' values and the role that values play in coming to agreement. The paper focuses on the role that values play in shaping common identity. Data were derived from document analysis and interviews with principals and teachers from two lower socioeconomic parochial schools, one of which had been rated by supervisors to be highly purposive and one that had been rated as distinctly less purposive. The sample consisted of a total of 2 principals and 13 teachers. The more purposive principal and the less purposive principal and their respective teachers displayed significantly different identities, with the less purposive school members demonstrating relatively small levels of common identity compared to personnel in the more purposive setting. The most important finding was that the more purposive principal and her teachers used many shared values to interpret and explain internal and external environments and their relationships to those environments, while the members of the less purposive school did not. It is important for school leaders to take advantage of the potency of values to shape a shared sense of organizational identity and organizational purposes. Six tables are included. (Contains 57 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

ED 406 733

Principals' Values: Coming to Shared Purposes Through a Values-Laden Sense of Identity?

Wesley O. Petersen

Department of Secondary Education
Towson State University
Towson, MD. 21204-7097
(410) 668-3060
e7s6pet@toe.towson.edu

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Eastern Educational Research Association
Hilton Head, South Carolina, February, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Petersen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

EA 028 298

PRINCIPALS' VALUES: COMING TO SHARED PURPOSES THROUGH A VALUES-LADEN SENSE OF IDENTITY?

Wesley O. Petersen, Ph.D.
Towson State University
Towson, Maryland 21204-7097

OVERVIEW

Principals considered by their supervisors to possess distinctly different levels of purpose are the subject of an ongoing examination. These investigations seek to extend understanding of how principals influence their schools' sense of purpose. Earlier studies in this series have found that more purposive and less purposive principals possess significantly different values awareness and values orientations (Petersen, 1991, 1993b) and utilize significantly different strategies to formulate and communicate ideas (Petersen, 1993a). This work has also revealed that teachers' and students' values awareness and orientations tend to reflect those of their principals (Petersen, 1994a, 1995). While previous papers have reported associations between principals' values and those of teachers and students, they have not suggested how purposeful schools come to agree on what purposes should be. This paper examines the relationship between principals' and teachers' values and the role it plays in coming to such agreement. Specifically, it looks at the role that values play in shaping identity.

BACKGROUND

An organization originates in order to serve consciously arrived at purposes or sets of purposes. Its longevity and health are contingent on remaining appropriately responsive to those purposes, or to new purposes that it can serve equally well. If an organization loses touch with its purposes, it loses vitality and utility. While traditional behaviors and tasks may remain, they hold diminished meaning and worth for the organization's membership, constituents, and clients. The pre-eminent responsibility of leaders is to foster, expand, and nurture the capacity of organizations to fulfill their legitimate purposes. A review of pertinent bodies of research and writing shows this prescription to be especially difficult for school leaders to fulfill. The policies, laws, and public opinions that govern and fund their institutions constitute a jumble of conflicting conceptions and purposes. This jumble leaves school administrators in the ethically uncomfortable position of being unsure of their schools' existing status, and confused about the future toward which they are supposed to lead. In addition, despite very promising research during the last two decades, the mechanisms by which leaders and organization members come to share common purposes remains clouded.

Leading to the unknown from the unknown: An ethical dilemma: Most organizations exist because they possess fairly well defined purposes. The various clusters of members who make up these enterprises know what it is that they have been organized to do, because they have fairly clear

conceptions of their clients, their competitors, and their individual roles. Yet, even in such settings, the vast literature on organizational development and leadership indicates that organization and leader performance is far from optimal (Bennis& Nanus, 1985; Deal and Kennedy,1986; Ouchi, 1981; Peters &Waterman, 1982). In schools, the quest for even *satisfactory* performance and leadership is a vastly more complicated journey.

Unlike private sector leaders or even the leaders of other public sector organizations, school leaders perform in contexts where core purposes are rarely certain. Spring (1993) outlines the conflicting policy interests that confront American education, centering these conflicts on three noncomplementary, but dearly held American values: *equity*, *efficiency*, and *liberty*. In her discussion of controversial issues confronting schools, Bierlein (1993) adds *excellence* to the mix of competing values.

That schools (their leaders, teachers, and students) must somehow accommodate these four competing values is by itself a nearly impossible task, but the challenge is heightened by interest groups' and courts' varied interpretations and perspectives on each of the four values. Spring (1993) points to groups whose competing calls see school purposes in terms such as: allocating power, building citizen loyalty, supporting teachers' unions, providing for lifetime employment and decent salaries for educators, eliminating poverty, giving voice to dominated groups, improving business competitiveness and profits, promoting multiculturalism and bilingualism, and promoting patriotism and a sense of national history, to name just a few. He also notes the lack of education expertise that sometimes leads the courts to make poor decisions. Bierlein (1993) identifies similar examples of the competing purposes and expectations for education. Among an almost inexhaustible list of purposes, she notes that schools are expected to: sort and track people for life opportunities, alleviate urban slum conditions; promote learning regarding hygiene, nutrition and child care; eliminate segregation; provide "relevant" learning; support educational autonomy; inculcate American values; confront capitalism, preserve democracy; pass on societal values and norms to future generations; maximize individual choice; promote academic learning; bring about equal educational outcomes, not just equal access; educate every child to his or her fullest potential; certify job skills; and provide education that is appropriate to local, state, and national conditions and needs. The breadth of purposes alone is difficult to comprehend. The lack of clear policy priorities suggests that there is little stomach among local, state, and national political figures for sorting out the values undergirding competing conceptions of education's purposes.

A consequence of this lack of direction is that schools and school systems become ensnared in policy implementation well before the debates on appropriate roles of schools have concluded. A further consequence is that conflicting purposes and expectations push schools to engage in bizarre behaviors to satisfy the roles conceived for them. In California, for example, Erickson (1993) describes how one school accommodates bilingual education, teacher certification, and contractual requirements, but in doing so, compromises the education of children. Perhaps nothing better illustrates the problem facing school leaders than the morass of conflicting agenda and purposes surrounding the effort to create national standards to assess student outcomes (Ravitch, 1996). While producing outcomes seems an unassailable purpose of schools, the difficulty in deciding *whose* outcomes has left schools the difficult task of divining the very meaning of *to educate*. Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) observe that from every quarter, schools are assailed for not fulfilling some group's sense of the schools' purposes. They conclude, "Aside from governmental institutions, few systems have come under more attack from a wide spectrum of groups than the schools" (pp. 174-

175). In this environment, school leaders and their teachers are expected, through implementation of policies, to fulfill a public trust, which seems impossible to articulate.

The problem is made worse because assessments of the very "health" of American education are situated among the same cherished but competing values mentioned earlier. On one hand, since *Nation at Risk* (1983), school leaders have been bombarded with dire warnings about how the weaknesses of their schools are undermining the country's future. On the other hand, other reports and commentaries have assured them that parents are quite satisfied with their children's education (e.g., Elam, 1993). The authors of several widely read articles have claimed that their painstaking reviews of the evidence show American education to be very nearly a model for the rest of the world (Bracey, 1991, 1992; Huelskamp, 1993). Berliner (1993) and Berliner and Biddle (1995) suggest that claims to the contrary are based on flawed information or the narrow self-interests of the well-to-do, the politicians, business leaders, and, more generally, "right wing" conservatives. However, other well-respected writers have criticized *these* views for being self-serving, flawed in rationality, and ignorant or dismissive of relevant evidence (Stedman, 1996a, 1996b). So leaders find themselves charged with leading others toward purposes that cannot be captured, and away from conditions and performances that also seem beyond anyone's firm ken.

The necessity of purposive environments and efforts guided by common purposes are undeniably essential to organizational success, but the mandate for schools to educate when the purpose and content of that education is continuously debated places schools in an ethically untenable position. This raises two dilemmas for schools. First, public or private, they are funded by citizens' tax dollars or by tuition dollars. By accepting others' money, schools implicitly, if not explicitly, agree to educate the people's children. In the absence of clear purposes educating becomes problematic, as does the proper allocation of resources. Second, as Greenfield (1995) points out, the immediate clients (the students) have little to say about the content or format of their education or about the schools that they attend; and their daily presence is legally compelled by attendance laws that do not consider students' individual desires or the quality of their schools. The expectation that schools will educate children in a manner that benefits rather than harms or disaffects a student population that has little control over what is done to it makes the schools "uniquely moral institutions" (Greenfield, 1995, p.63). This moral nature of schools holds the people who work in them to a necessarily high standard that, in the light of so many purposes, is difficult to attain and to maintain. Recent changes in conceptions of schools as self-regulating organizations have made this pursuit of purposes perhaps even more difficult.

With the "autonomy" that site-based management and shared-decision making have given schools, the opportunity to be more responsive to local needs and locally defined purposes has expanded somewhat, but for school personnel and leaders, the challenge in defining purposes has in many cases simply made the diverse views present in the local school and community more immediate, more intense, and much more personally vexing. This change makes the principal's role and influence much more significant. While principals have always been articulators and administrators of system policy, usually their leadership has been framed in terms of instruction or in terms of promoting and implementing district-conceived school change initiatives. Important as these leadership acts are, in the day-to-day of school life, leading often has been sacrificed to administering and maintaining system mandates or to ensuring an orderly and calm environment. This is no longer acceptable; leadership is now an immediate and unavoidable imperative. School leaders must be able to lead members of their schools and their school communities through the

shared decision-making process to arrive voluntarily at common purposes. The consequences of not succeeding now fall squarely on principals' shoulders. The issue for researchers is to understand how some principals manage to orient and commit their schools to shared purposes despite odds that are certainly against them.

Research progress and shortcomings: The research on organization/school leadership has produced findings that have moved the field tantalizingly close to being able to describe the basic building blocks of leadership. Four blocks that appear to be in place include those relating to the leader: 1) attention to direction or purpose; 2) attention to, and capacity for communication; 3) problem-solving facility; and 4) sense of identity or awareness.

Direction. It is increasingly apparent that purposive or expert leaders operate from a values base (Blase & Kirby, 1992; Fullan, 1985, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992; Petersen, 1993b) that influences their framing and interpretations of problems (Leithwood, Begley, & Cousins, 1994), and becomes entwined in the values of their students and teachers (Petersen, 1994a, 1995). It is also fairly accepted that purposive leaders envision richly textured possible futures (Achilles, 1987; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Manasse, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1987; Sheive & Schoenheit, 1987), are goal directed (Murphy & Hallinger, 1988; Rutherford, 1985) and hold clear expectations for the achievement of goals (Pascarella & Frohman, 1989). In a word, leaders have a *purposing* (Vaill, 1984) orientation to their role.

Communication. Compared to their less purposive counterparts, purposive leaders appear to possess different communication skills (Petersen, 1993a, 1994b), attend more to facilitating and promoting communication in the organization (Barnard, 1938; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Nanus 1989) and interpret the task of communication differently (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982).

Problem-solving. Work on the cognitive aspects of leadership show that more capable, but not necessarily more experienced school leaders exhibit problem-solving strategies that are unlike the strategies of less able leaders (Allison & Allison, 1991, 1993). In a series of tests using hypothetical and actual problems of principals and superintendents, investigators have found that more expert principals and superintendents use values as knowledge substitutes in information poor situations and as perceptual screens in information rich conditions (Leithwood & Stager, 1986; Leithwood, Steinbach, & Raun, 1993; Raun & Leithwood, 1993).

Identity. The ability to discern and identify aspects of various environments and to appraise individuals' strengths and weaknesses appears to be a fourth *block* that differentiates more purposive or expert leaders from more typical counterparts. A number of writers have reported that perceptual differences appear to lead some principals to view themselves as powerless in their environments (Boyer, 1983; Cooper, 1979; Wayson, 1979) while others see opportunities to be exploited (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1986).

Missing Blocks. Research increasingly points to the capabilities and characteristics that define leaders, but until understanding of leadership also includes an understanding of the links between leaders and those led, the ability to lead in environments with conflicting purposes will be hampered. While previous work has shown that purposive principals, their teachers, and students share common values (Petersen, 1994a, 1994b, 1995), there is little awareness of how this commonality may affect other aspects important to developing a sense of organizational purpose. Among areas that need further examination are investigations of principals' and teachers' senses of identity, their visions, goals, and expectations, and their conceptions of appropriate actions. This

study examines sense of identity and its relationship to values.

While there is evidence that principals' values can influence teachers' values (Petersen, 1995), there is need for research into the possible relationship between principals' and teachers' senses of identity, and the potential role played by values in shaping identity. This is an important area of inquiry because, as Kronowitz (1992) has noted, one reason that teachers leave teaching is based on their unrealistic expectations and value conflicts. Like their peers in the private sector, teachers want to stand for something, want to know what to expect, and want their schools to live up to expectations. As leaders of moral institutions, principals can ill-afford poorly defined purposes or characterizations of school contexts (identity) that do not resonate with teachers. Long term commitments by an organization's membership are necessary to build and institutionalize an organization-wide sense of purpose, and this cannot be achieved with a skeptical and itinerant work force. Neither can it be achieved when assessments of the environment lead to misconceptions regarding the relationship between school and school context. The degree to which leaders and organization members agree on the features of the environment will influence the degree to which purposes are embraced. Intuitively, values would seem to be an important lens through which to view the environment. If research can show a relationship between principals' values and members' sense of identity, the capacity of principals to know their values and to make them known grows in importance and adds a piece to the missing building blocks. To explore these issues this study focused on the areas of *values*[1], *identity*, and *values-in-identity*.

METHODS

Data Sources and Collection: Data were acquired from interviews and artifacts. Respondents included principals and teachers from two lower SES parochial schools[2], one of which had been rated by supervisors to be highly purposive and one which had been rated as distinctly less so. Ratings of principals and their schools were not revealed to the investigator during the study. The principal of the less purposive school was an Hispanic lay principal with extensive experience at her school, first as a parent, then as teacher, assistant principal, and finally as principal. At the time of the interview, she had been principal for approximately two years, and had taught and/or served as an assistant principal in the school for eight years. The principal of the more purposive school was a non-Hispanic, Caucasian member of a religious order. She had four years of experience (all as principal) at her school, but possessed extensive prior experience both as teacher and principal in predominantly higher SES schools in the northern half of the state --a distinctly different region. Principals of both schools estimated their teachers' average tenure to be in the range of 2 to 4 years. At the less purposive school, six teachers participated in interviews. Two of the six were hired by

---

[1]In part, the examination of values is a reanalysis of data from an earlier study of four principals (Petersen, 1993), of which the two studied here were a part. Findings here support the earlier work, showing that the principals do orient differently to values.

[2]Parochial schools became the study sites precisely because of the lack of agreement on purposes in the public schools. By studying principals and teachers in settings where the Catholic Church establishes many of the purposes, and the parish provides for some degree homogeneity, it was easier to examine principals' influence.

the principal. Seven teachers at the more purposive school participated in interviews. Six of the seven were hired by the principal.

Interviews were conducted and artifacts collected. Both principals and teachers participated in two types of interviews: *Values* interviews and *identity* (awareness of internal and external environments and people) interviews. Values interviews raised questions about personal, professional, and most important (core) values. Identity interviews asked questions regarding awareness of external and internal environments, strengths and weaknesses of members (including self, for the principal interview), and awareness of obstacles and opportunities. Principal interviews were conducted in face-to-face sessions. Most teacher interviews were conducted on the telephone, though teachers had the option of face-to-face sessions. Artifacts included three types: School Handbooks (Philosophy, Discipline and Attendance statements), teacher bulletins, and parent newsletters. The contents of the artifacts were either authored by or under the direct control of the principals. A random sampling of five newsletters and five bulletins from each principal were used. Artifacts were examined for evidence of principals' and teachers' values and senses of identity.

Table 1 illustrates the number of interview and artifact lines analyzed.

Table 1. Artifact Lines Analyzed by Type.

	Less Purposive School			More Purposive School		
	Principal	**Teachers**	**School**	**Principal**	**Teachers**	**School**
Values Interview Lines	151	150	301	193	169	362
Identity Interview Lines	1020	1209	2429	1514	1895	3409
Artifact Lines	365			288		

Principals and teachers were encouraged to respond as completely as they could to all interview questions. There were no limits on the lengths of interviews. Each selected artifact was examined in its entirety.

Data Reduction and Analysis: In general, interviews and artifacts were scanned for statements that reflected a values or identity perspective, or both. Matrix structures similar to those described by Miles and Huberman (1984) were then utilized to categorize and analyze data. Tables 2-6 reflect the results of this reduction. From these tables data then were analyzed using the X^2 test of proportions. Resultant *z-scores* were used to determine whether differences between the members of more and less purposive schools were statistically significant.

Values. Values terms from values interviews have been used in three prior studies (Petersen,1993b, 1994b, &1995) to assess differences in more and less purposive principals' orientations to values and to assess differences in the depth of their teachers' awareness of those values. Here, values were reanalyzed to confirm differences in the principals and to confirm differences in their teachers. The primary interest of this new analysis, however, was on the degree to which the schools (principals + teachers) displayed *variation*, expressed as the introduction of unique values (those uttered by only one person), and *adherence* to shared values (those uttered by the principal and at least one teacher). *Categories* of values and total numbers of values *statements* were considered in this way. Two additional comparisons were made. One considered each school's

use of its principal's alleged "most important value." The other considered the presence of values in artifactual statements. For each values comparison, the X^2 test of proportions was used to evaluate whether there were differences between the two schools. These analyses confirmed that the more purposive principal and her teachers were similar to each other, but significantly different from the less purposive principal and her teachers. These findings justified the search for differences in the two schools' senses of identity (awareness of environments and people) and an examination of principals' and teachers' uses of their values to frame their senses of identity.

Identity. Knowing that the two schools and their members represented different populations, attention turned to principals' and teachers' senses of identity, as expressed in the set of *identity* interviews. Artifacts were also examined to assess sense of identity. As with *values*, analyses focused on potential differences between the more and less purposive populations. Proportions of unique and shared *topics* and *statements* were analyzed using the X^2 test of proportions. The X^2 test was also utilized to compare the two schools' artifact statements. While significant differences were found in the more and less purposive populations' interview data, none were found in their artifact data. Results led to an examination of the potential role that values may play in developing or shaping one's environmental awareness.

Values in Identity. This analysis was motivated by an observation by Sergiovanni (1992), that an organization's values are the source of identity for individuals and groups. Sergiovanni's observation points out that values serve to cement members' sense of belonging through identification *with* the organization, but the observation raises the tantalizing question of whether these values may accomplish this sense of affiliation by shaping how one sees one's environment and the people within them. To test this possibility, *identity* interviews for the more and less purposive populations were re-examined for evidence of the values mentioned in the *values* interviews. Proportions of total values categories, as well as proportions of unique and shared values categories were analyzed using the X^2 test of proportions.

FINDINGS

In each area of analysis, excepting *identity statements in artifacts* (Table 5), there were significant differences between the more and less purposive populations.

Values: Examination of the values interview data revealed highly significant differences in the use of values by more and less purposive principals and their teachers (Table 2).

Categories of Values. At the school level, a comparison of the two schools reveals that less purposive school members generate a greater proportion of unique values categories (86%) than do more purposive school members (56%). This difference is significant at the 0.007 level. Since the proportion of shared values categories generated is the reciprocal of the proportion of unique categories generated, these differences are also significant at the 0.007 level. The proportion of shared values categories generated by the less purposive school is 14%, compared to 44% for the more purposive school. These findings suggest less agreement on the types of values that are important in the less purposive school, while there is greater coalescence around a set of values categories by the more purposive school's members.

Values Statements. The proportion of each principal's unique and shared values statements were compared. In similar fashion the differences between the two faculties, and the two schools

were calculated. All comparisons were significant. The less purposive principal uttered significantly greater proportion of unique values statements (70%) and a significantly lesser proportion of shared values statements (30%) statements than did the more purposive principal whose unique utterances amounted to 28% of all her value statements while her shared utterances accounted for 71% of her values statements. These differences were significant at $p<0.0001$.

Faculties at the two schools also differed significantly in their predispositions to utter unique or shared values statements. For unique utterances, proportions ranged from 63% for the less purposive faculty to 9% for the more purposive faculty. Shared utterances ranged from 37% for the less purposive group to 91% for the more purposive teachers. These differences were significant at $p<0.0001$.

Table 2. Values Interview: Total Values Categories and Statements.

	Less Purposive School			More Purposive School		
Categories & Statements	**Principal N=1**	**Teachers N=6**	**School N=7**	**Principal N=1**	**Teachers N=7**	**School N=8**
I. Total Values Categories	--	--	35	--	--	18
Unique Values Categories Introduced	13	17	30/35 (.86)[a]	7	3	10/18 (.56)[b]
Shared Values Categories[3] Introduced	--	--	5/35 (.14)[a1]	--	--	8/18 (.44)[b1]
II. Total Values Statements	44	46	90	42	57	99
Unique Values Statements Generated	31/44 (.70)[c]	29/46 (.63)[e]	60/90 (.67)[g]	12/42 (.28)[d]	5/57 (.09)[f]	17/99 (.17)[h]
Shared Values Statements Generated	13/44 (.30)[c1]	17/46 (.37)[e1]	30/90 (.33)[g1]	30/42 (.71)[d1]	52/57 (.91)[f1]	82/99 (.83)[h1]
Most Important Value Mentions	11	--	11/90 (.12)[j]	7	18	(25/99) (.25)[k]

The x^2 test of proportion showed the following comparisons to be significantly different: a vs. b and a^1 vs. b^1, $p<.007$; c vs d and c^1 vs. d^1, $p<.0001$; e vs. f and e^1 vs. f^1, $p<.00001$; g vs. h and g^1 vs. h^1, $p<.0001$; j vs. k, $p<.013$.

Given the significant differences between the two principals and between the two faculties, it is a given that the two schools demonstrate significant differences. At the school level, the proportion of unique values statements ranged from 67% at the less purposive institution to 17% at the more purposive one. The proportion of shared values ranged from 33% at the less purposive one to 83% at the more purposive ones. These differences were significant at $p<0.0001$.

Most Important Value. Each principal was asked to identify her most important value. For the less purposive principal, this was described as "forging ahead" or "muddling through." For the

[3]Shared refers to a statement or category that is common to the principal and at least one teacher.

more purposive principal, this value was described as "commitment" that extended from life as a religious to commitment as "an educator to excellence in instruction for all children." When principals' and faculty's values statements were examined for the presence of these values, the proportion of statements registering awareness was 12% compared to a proportion of awareness of 25% for the more purposive school. This difference was significant at $p<0.013$. It is significant that none of the less purposive school's teachers demonstrated any awareness of their principal's most important value.

Values in Artifacts. Table 3 illustrates the results of the comparison of values categories and statements found in the two schools' artifacts. With regard to the proportion of total and shared values categories present, there were no significant differences, but principals differed significantly in their emphasis of values shared with their teachers. Where 57% of the less purposive principal's artifact statements were based on shared values, 90% of the more purposive principal's statements derived from shared values. This difference is significant at $p<0.0001$.

Table 3. Evidence of Values Influence in Artifacts.

Category of Interest	Less Purposive School	More Purposive School
Total Values Categories Possible (from Values Interviews)	35	18
Values Categories Present in Artifacts	16/35 (.46)	9/18 (.50)
Shared Values Categories (from Values Interviews) Present in Artifacts	5/35 (.14)	5/18 (.28)
Proportion of Values Categories found in the Artifacts that are Shared Values Categories	5/16 (.31)	5/9 (.56)
Number of Values Statements in Artifacts that Originate from Established Values Categories	60	75
Proportion of Artifact Values Statements that are Shared Values Statements (Statements originating in Shared Values Categories)	34/60 (.57)[l]	68/75 (.90)[m]

The χ^2 test for proportions showed that the proportion of shared values statements found in the artifacts of the less purposive school were significantly fewer than the proportion found in the more purposive school's artifacts: l vs. m, $p< .0001$.

In summary, the values findings demonstrate an unmistakable difference between more purposive and less purposive schools. In more purposive settings, principals and teachers possess a greater commonality of values. Attention now turns to Identity.

Identity. Analysis of data from principal and teacher *identity* interviews reveals significant differences in more and less purposive schools' members' views of their environment and the people within them. These data, displayed in Table 4, establish that like the commonalities among values found in the more purposive school, there are parallel commonalities among members' senses of identity. This level of "stability of view" is absent from the senses of identity found among members of the less purposive school.

Identity Topics. School level comparisons of the production of identity topics by less and more purposive schools show that the less purposive school generates a significantly greater proportion of unique topics (70% vs. 53%). This difference is significant at $p<0.005$. When comparing generation of shared identity topics, the less purposive school generates a significantly smaller proportion (30%) compared to its more purposive counterpart (47%). These differences are

Table 4. Identity Interview: Total Identity Topics and Statements.

	Less Purposive School			More Purposive School		
Topics & Statements	**Principal N=1**	**Teachers N=6**	**School N=7**	**Principal N=1**	**Teachers N=7**	**School N=8**
I. Total Identity Topics	--	--	119	--	--	105
Unique Identity Topics Introduced	28	55	83/119 (.70)^{n}	11	45	56/105 (.53)^{o}
Shared Identity Topics Introduced	--	--	36/119 (.30)^{n1}	--	--	49/105 (.47)^{o1}
II. Total Identity Statements	107	349	456	243	485	728
Unique Identity Statements Generated	38/107 (.36)^{p}	137/349 (.39)^{r}	175/456 (.38)^{t}	21/243 (.09)^{q}	111/485 (.23)^{s}	137/728 (.19)^{u}
Shared Identity Statements Generated	69/107 (.64)^{p1}	212/349 (.61)^{r1}	281/456 (.62)^{t1}	222/243 (.91)^{q1}	374/485 (.77)^{s1}	596/728 (.82)^{u1}

The x^2 test of proportion showed the following comparisons to be significantly different: n vs. o and n^1 vs o^1, $p<.005$; p vs. q and p^1 vs q^1, $p<.00001$; r vs. s and r^1 vs s^1, $p<.0001$; t vs. u and t^1 vs. u^1, $p<.0001$

also significant at $p<0.005$. These findings indicate that in purposive schools there is less variation and greater agreement about the topics of importance in the environments. Given that both schools are lower SES schools facing many of the same circumstances and constraints, this is a finding of potential importance.

Identity Statements. Identity statements are those statements that are made about Identity topics. Counts of statements and their alignment with either unique or shared topics, permits proportions of usage by the two schools to be compared. Comparisons between schools and between the schools' members of the proportions of unique and shared statements revealed several significant differences. Differences between principals will be discussed, followed by discussion of the two schools' teachers, and finally discussion of the schools, themselves.

Out of 107 statements made in relation to various identity categories, 36% or 38 of the less purposive principal's statements involved unique topics. Out of the same 107 statements 64% or 69 statements related to shared topics. These proportions differed significantly from those of the more purposive principal who spoke only 21 statements on unique topics out of a total of 243 statements, but spoke 91% or 222 statements in relation to shared topics. These differences are highly significant at $p<0.00001$.

When teachers in the two schools are compared, differences are also highly significant at $p<0.0001$. The teachers in the less purposive school generated a total of 349 identity statements. Of these 137 (39%) are unique and 212 (61%) are shared. This compares to the more purposive

school's teachers who generated a total of 485 identity statements, of which 111 (23%) are unique and 374 (77%) are shared.

At the school level these differences are significant at $p<0.0001$. Of the total statements produced (456) by the less purposive school, 38 are unique and 62% are shared. This compares to a total of 728 identity statements in the more purposive school, where 19% of all statements are unique and 82%[4] are shared. While in both schools the bulk of statements regard shared identity topics, the greater use by those in the more purposive school would suggest that those topics (though fewer in number) receive substantially greater attention. The degree of attention may indicate a greater depth to the common identity of those in the more purposive school.

Identity in Artifacts. Table 5 shows that while there is greater presence of identity topics and statements in the artifacts of the more purposive principal's school when compared to the other school, there is no significant difference between the two. This may be due to the size of the sample, though similar numbers of lines in the values interviews produced significant differences. Another possible explanation may lie in the ways that information about one's environment is acquired and communicated. It may be that identity information is less effectively conveyed in written form. It may also be that the information conveyed is irrelevant, so long as the values are clearly understood. Perhaps, as values become clarified and shared, they begin to focus individuals to see their environments in similar ways. If this is the case, there would be less need to convey identity information in written form, the presence of shared values would serve to sufficiently sensitize members to important elements of the environment. The role of values in shaping identity will be discussed next.

Table 5. Evidence of Identity Influence in Artifacts.

Category of Interest	Less Purposive School	More Purposive School
Total Identity Topics Possible (from Identity Interviews)	119	105
Identity Topics Present in Artifacts	11/119 (.09)	16/105 (.15)
Total Shared Topics Possible (from Identity Interviews)	36	49
Shared Identity Topics Present in Artifacts out of Possible Shared Topics	5/36 (.14)	9/49 (.18)
Shared Identity Topics Present out of Identity Topics Present in Artifacts	5/11 (.45)	9/16 (.56)
Total Artifact Statements Reflecting Identity Topics	25	82
Total Artifact Statements Reflecting Shared Topics	16/25 (.64)	57/82 (.70)

x^2 test of proportion revealed no significant differences.

[4]Throughout, values not totaling 1.00 reflect rounding.

Values in Identity. This section considers the degree to which values are used to explain and interpret Identity. Identity interviews were re-read to locate all values categories that coincided with categories originally identified in the Values interview. There were three significant differences identified (Table 6).

First the proportion of total values categories present in each school's identity interviews differed significantly. Nineteen of 35 values categories (54%) were present in the less purposive school's Identity interviews. This compared to a total of 16 of 18 values categories (89%) present in the Identity interviews of the more purposive school. This difference was significant at $p<0.006$

The allocation of unique and shared values appeared in a manner paralleling their distribution in the Values interviews, with the less purposive school demonstrating more variation (greater use of unique values) with 17 of 19 values (89%) being referenced by one person in the school. Only 2 of 19 values (10%) were shared in the less purposive school. The allocation of unique and shared values categories in the more purposive school were equally divided with 8 of 16 values (50%) being in each of the unique and shared categories. These differences were also significantly different at $p<0.006$.

The way the more purposive principal and her teachers relied on values to respond to Identity interview questions suggests that values can be an important component in helping teachers and principals interpret their contexts. Even more important, the findings suggest schools that can coalesce around shared values may be more likely to agree on important features within their environments. Agreement on issues of values and issues of identity would not necessarily result in making better decisions--everyone could misread the environment--but such agreement would at least afford principals and teacher to work together because of their shared values and perceptions. Such commonality should result in more purposive behavior, and greater member identification with the organization (Sergiovanni, 1992).

Table 6. Values Present in the Identity Interview

	Less Purposive School			More Purposive School		
Categories of Interest	**Principal N=1**	**Teachers N=6**	**School N=7**	**Principal N=1**	**Teachers N=7**	**School N=8**
Total Values Categories Possible (from Values Interview)	--	--	**35**	--	--	**18**
Number of Values Categories Found in Identity Interviews	--	--	**19/35 (.54)^{v}**	--	--	**16/18 (.89)^{w}**
Number of Values Categories that are Unique in the Identity Interviews	5	12	**17/19 (.89)^{x}**	5	3	**8/16 (.50)^{y}**
Number of Values Categories that are Shared in the Identity Interviews	--	--	**2/19 (.10)^{x1}**	--	--	**8/16 (.50)^{y1}**

x^2 test of proportions showed the following comparisons to be statistically different: v vs. w, $p<.006$; x vs. y and x^1 vs. y^1, $p<.006$.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The foregoing have shown that principals and teachers in a more purposive school and a less purposive school orient differently, significantly so, to matters of values and identity. Findings have shown that, in general, personnel in more purposive schools tend to fix on shared values and shared identities. While focus on identity does not seem to be aided or reinforced by written artifacts, values do seem to be supported and emphasized in the artifacts of the purposive school. Based on these findings a number of specific and general observations may be made. Observations specific to the various analyses will be discussed first.

What Difference do Values Differences Make? Taken as a whole the nine significant findings developed from analysis of the values data suggest emphatically, that the two schools are different populations, oriented in the case of the more purposive school to focus on fewer rather than more values, and inclined to talk a lot about those limited numbers of values. Based on the writings of a number of authors who have proposed that values serve as an anchor for much of what is proposed and pursued in successful organizations (e.g., Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Greenfield, 1987, 1991a, 1991b) an examination of the two schools' visions, goals, and expectations is appropriate. If values are critical, one would expect them to influence the texture, complexity, and completeness of vision, goals, and expectations. If the findings by Leithwood et al (e.g., Leithwood, Steinbach, & Raun, 1993; Raun, Leithwood, 1993) on the relationship between problem-solving and values are accurate, future study of these principals should be able to find evidence of principal's values guiding decisions regarding problems of program development, fund raising, teacher supervision, and teacher selection, since virtually any decision-making task is based on the explicit or implicit resolution or response to a problem. As we will see below, it does appear that the degree to which principals and their teachers orient around a core of values seems to influence how they assess the features of their identities.

The practical application of these findings is limited by the small size of the study, but they do suggest potential avenues for the administrator to explore. Administrators eager to improve the purposiveness of their schools could benefit by reflecting on and identifying their own values and the methods that they use to make them known in their schools. They could also benefit by sampling the values held by their school's teachers (In Petersen [1994], even student values were sampled), and comparing teachers' expressed values with their own. Such reflection and sampling would enable principals to identify areas of misperceived or misunderstood values. A principal might also use the effort to target certain values or purposes for reinforcement.

The findings also have possible applications for the supervision, assessment, and selection of principals. Fairly brief interviews could be developed to acquire baseline information about principals' and principal candidates' values awareness and commitment. Those having difficulty recognizing their values may become candidates for special assistance or training. As a tool in candidate selection, an aspirants' values articulations could become useful indicators of their readiness or fitness for leadership. In assessment circumstances, the opportunity to compare words with deeds would be very useful for helping leaders understand contradictions in values espoused and values in action.

When Identity is Shared. This paper reported that the more purposive principal and the less purposive principal and their respective teachers displayed significantly different identities, with the

less purposive school members demonstrating relatively small levels of common identity compared to personnel in the more purposive setting. This is an important finding, because it highlights one potential obstacle to school progress. In settings where there is little agreement regarding the features of internal and external environments, it is likely that there will be little member commitment to espoused organizational purposes.

In a purposive school, people work on behalf of the school's mission and pursue its vision, because they believe in what the school stands for and believe that they are contributing, that they are "making a difference." Part of this sense derives from a perception that the organization has situated itself appropriately in relation to its environment. When sense of Identity is shared and pervasive, members do not perceive their efforts to be in vain. Pascarella and Frohman's (1989) observations apply here. They point out that today's workers rebel against purposeless activity and are not afraid to leave the workplace that does not meet their need for congruent purposes (p. 26). Such opting out is endemic among teachers, especially at the beginning of their careers. Some reports estimate that between 40 and 50 percent leave the occupation within three to seven years (Schlechty & Vance, 1983). As noted elsewhere, a part of this "bailing out" reflex is due to unrealistic expectations (Kronowitz, 1992). Principals concerned with improving faculty commitment and stability will likely benefit from attempts to help their school members acquire a shared understanding of their environments. This is also a useful area for principal supervisors to explore. With relatively little investment, supervisors can gain substantial insights into senses of identity that either aid or retard a school's perception of itself in relation to its contexts.

When Values Inform Identity. The most important finding of this study is that the more purposive principal and her teachers used many shared values to interpret and explain internal and external environments and their relationships to those environments, while the members of the less purposive school did not. That values should be found in Identity interviews in proportions that parallel their presence in Values interviews suggests the orienting nature of values *when those values are consciously held and widely known.* Where values are not well known and agreed upon, there appears to be little consensus on the school's relationship to its environment or to its members. This finding points toward an explanation for the importance of values in establishing vision, goals, and expectations, and justifying actions. Serving as perceptual screens, values interpret and then justify particular views of the *world* (Hambrick and Brandon, 1988). Where values are known to the individual, they justify his or her world view. Where they are shared by others, they enable organization members to talk about their world and understand it in complementary ways. When understandings of contexts are shared, the capacity to envision alternative futures that satisfy members' senses of identity is enhanced. Principals eager to develop common interpretations of current conditions may derive substantial assistance in their change efforts if they attend to developing the set of values through which members may hold a shared understanding of their circumstances. The significant presence of values in purposive members' talk about identity suggests that values should be at the very center of principal assessment, selection, and training--if these findings can be replicated.

FINAL OBSERVATIONS. In the face of trying circumstances where the actual purposes of education are difficult to identify, and uncertainty and conflict over purposes are key elements of the schooling environment, it is important for school leaders to take advantage of the potency of

values to shape a shared sense of organizational identity and a shared sense of the organization's purposes. It appears from this study of two principals that ignoring values jeopardizes teachers' opportunities to become purposive, and jeopardizes students' opportunities to acquire an education that is commensurate to the needs of the environments from which they come.

REFERENCES

Achilles, C. M. (1987). A vision of better schools. In W. Greenfield (Ed.). Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies. Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Allison, P. A., & Allison, D. J. (1991, April). Experience and expertise in administrative problem solving. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Allison, D. J., & Allison, P. A. (1993). Both ends of a telescope: experience and expertise in principal problem solving. Educational Administration Quarterly 29 (3), 302-322.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). The functions of the executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Berliner, D. (1993). Educational reform in an era of disinformation. Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 4(3). http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v1n2.html.

Berliner, D. & Biddle, B. (1995). The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Bierlein, L. A. (1993). Controversial issues in educational policy. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Blase, J. & Kirby, P. (1992). Bringing out the best in Teachers: What effective principals do. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. (1986). The effective principal: perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyer, E. (1983). High school. New York: Harper & Row.

Bracey, G. (1991). Why can't they be like we were? Phi Delta Kappan (October), 105-117.

Bracey, G. (1992). The second Bracey report on the condition of public education. Phi Delta Kappan (October), 104-117.

Cooper, B. S. (1979). The future of middle management in education. In D. A. Erickson & R. L. Reller (Eds.) The Principal in Metropolitan Schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1986). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Elam, S., & Rose, L. (1993). The 27th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(1), 41-56.

Erickson, D. A. (1993). "Educating" immigrants. Unpublished manuscript.

Fullan, M. (1985). Chang processes and strategies at the local level. The Elementary School Journal,85, 391-421.

Fullan, M. (1990). Change processes in secondary schools: Toward a more fundamental agenda. In M. W. McLaughlin, J. E. Talbert, and N. Bascia (Eds.), The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greenfield, W. D. (1986). Moral social, and technical dimensions of the principalship. Peabody Journal of Education, 63, 138-149.

Greenfield, W. (1987). Moral imagination and interpersonal competence: Antecedents to instructional leadership. In W. Greenfield (Ed.). Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Greenfield, W. (1991a, April). Rationale and methods to articulate values and ethics in administrator training. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Greenfield, W. D. (1991b, April). Toward a theory of school leadership. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Greenfield, W. D. (1995) Toward a theory of school administration: The centrality of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31 (1), 61-85.

Hambrick, D. C. & Brandon, G. L. (1988). Executive values. In D. C. Hambrick (Ed.), The executive effect: Concepts and methods for studying top managers. Greenwich CT: Jai Press.

Huelskamp, R. (1993). Perspectives on American education. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(9), 718-722.

Kronowitz, E. L. (1992). Beyond student teaching. New York: Longman.

Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal

in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52 (3), 309-339.

Leithwood, K. A., & Stager, M. (1986, April). Differences in problem solving processes used by moderately and highly effective principals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Leithwood, K. A., Steinbach, R., & Raun, T. (1993). Superintendent's group problem-solving processes. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29 (3), 364-391.

Leithwood, K., Begley, P. T., & Cousins, J. B. (1994). Developing Expert Leadership for Future Schools. London: Falmer.

Manasse, A. L. (1985). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy implications of research. The Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 138-162.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Murphy, J. & Hallinger, P. (1988). Characteristics of instructionally effective school districts. Journal of Educational Research, 81, 175-181.

Nanus, B. The leader's edge. Chicago: Contemporary Books.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983, April). A nation at risk: The imperative of educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z. Reading, MA.

Pascarella, P., & Frohman, M. A. (1989). The purpose-driven organization: Unleashing the power of direction and commitment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peters T. J., & Waterman, R.H. Jr. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. Cambridge: Harper & Row. 1982.

Petersen, W. O. (1991/1992). Making sense of purpose: The principal's role (Doctoral dissertation, University of California). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52,2355A-2356A. (University Microfilms No. 9135177)

Petersen, W. O. (1993a, February). Principals as communicators: Making sense of purpose. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater, Florida.

Petersen, W. O. (1993b, April). The value of values: A study of four principals. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Petersen, W. O. (1994a, February). Principal purposiveness and student perceptions of school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Sarasota, Florida.

Petersen, W. O. (1994b, April). Values, communication, and purpose: What four principals revealed. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Petersen, W. O. (1995, March). What do teachers know about their principals' values? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC.

Raun, T. & Leithwood, K. (1993). Pragmatism, Participation, and Duty: Value Themes in Superintendents' Problem-Solving. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), Cognitive Perspectives on Educational Leadership. New York: Teachers College.

Ravitch, D. (1996, Summer). 50 states, 50 standards: The continuing need for national voluntary standards in education. Brookings Review.

Rutherford, W. (1985). School principals as effective leaders. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 31-34.

Schlecty, P. C. & Vance, V. S. (1983). Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83 (4), 469-487.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sheive, L. T., & Schoenheit, M. B. (1987). Visions and the work life of educational leaders. In L. T. Sheive & M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), Leadership: examining the elusive. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Spring, J. (1993). Conflict of Interest: The politics of American education. New York: Longman.

Stager, M., & Leithwood, K. A. (1989). Cognitive flexibility and inflexibility in principals' problem solving. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 35, 217-236.

Stedman, L. C. (1996a). The achievement crisis is real: A review of The Manufactured Crisis. Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 4(1), 1-11. http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v4n1.html.

Stedman, L. C. (1996b). Respecting the evidence: The achievement crisis remains real. Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 4(7), 1-34. http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v4n7.html.

Vaill, P. B. (1986). The purposing of high performing systems. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice (pp. 85-104). Urbana: University of Chicago Press.

Wayson, W. (1979). A view of the leadership shortage in school buildings. In D.A. Erickson & R. L. Reller (Eds.) The principal in metropolitan schools. Berkeley: McCutchan.